

Lindenberg Peninsula and Mitkof Island Stewardship Workshop #3

Meeting Notes

May 23, 2012 6:30 pm

Petersburg Ranger District Conference Room

Attendees: Jason Anderson (FS District Ranger), Tom Parker (FS Planning Staff), Herold Medalen, Sal Cangialosi, Craig Anderson, Becky Knight, Brian Paust, Mike Bell, Dave Randrup, Don Koenigs, Paul Anderson, Eric Lee, Liz Cabrera, Camie Pederson (FS note taker)

Maps Displayed:

- PRD Managed Stands and NEPA Cleared Units
- Collaboration Place Map
- Tonka Selected Alternative Map
- Tonka Timber Sale Figures: 2-1, 2-2, 2-3
- Province #10 Tonka Project Area and WAAs

Summary: Jason made it clear that the timeline is unreasonable to add new projects to the Tonka Stewardship Contract before August because of the NEPA timeline (i.e., the environmental analysis required on any new projects). The discussion then lead more into criteria for prioritizing red pipes for replacement and then more into the Best Value Criteria for contracting. The forum also focused on more topics to be discussed for future projects as well.

Highlights:

- Agency criteria for prioritizing red pipe replacement were discussed and handout was printed for the group to examine. It created a clearer picture for the group to understand why certain pipes are higher priority.
- Best Value Criteria for contracting was further explained and it was clarified that the example criteria provided in the previous workshop could be modified to better reflect what the public sees as more important "local benefit" criteria for the Tonka Stewardship Project.
- Retained receipts questions were answered in regards to funding from Stewardship Contracting.
- It was agreed that more time in between meetings would be arranged, so that presentations from resource specialists can be arranged for future meetings.

Things for the Forest Service to do/have for next meeting:

- Send out meetings notes in PDF format
- Bring more information on the study being done by 8-10 people on clear cuts (there was some confusion as to which study was being referred to)
- Slide show / presentations about red pipes and streams
- List of streams for enhancement

Discussion:

- J. Anderson reiterated the collaborative process. These meetings are important to getting feedback from the public for projects going on now and contemplated for the future. Also in his introduction he explained that because of public involvement (NEPA requirements) for new projects, it might not be possible for the FS to contemplate new activities as part of the Tonka Stewardship Contract this August. There is no “shelf stock” of NEPA completed restoration / enhancement activities to put in the Tonka contract. J. Anderson also mentioned that the timber sale can go forward using the stewardship authority, and still retain the receipts under that authority to address red pipes and other desirable land management objectives (thinning, etc.)
- B. Knight: There is a way to include stewardship for August? J Anderson: Not practical under this timeline. The requirements for public involvement on new actions wouldn’t be met in time, and there were only 3 lower-priority red pipes ready for inclusion in the Tonka Project (all 3 were analyzed as part of the Petersburg Ranger District Access and Travel Management Plan).
- C. Anderson mentioned a copy of the Log Jam stewardship proposal as a potential reference for the discussion. J. Anderson stepped out to get a copy.
- It was asked to clarify that things can be added to the proposal, and further refined at a later date? J Anderson: Yes, they would need to identify the types of things to be added, with the intent to scope, analyze and involve the public in the specific actions in the near future.
- It was then asked why the 3 pipes that are already NEPA approved (PRD ATM) be added in now? B. Knight identified that the deadline for the August contract is in July and suggested that in order to get something included now in Tonka, the 3 NEPA-cleared pipes should be included because they’re in violation of the Clean Water Act.
- J. Anderson: Agreed that it was possible to include those 3 pipes from the ATM, and identified his preference to pursue other pipes in Tonka that would recover more habitat or are more cost-effective than the 3 pipes that are already cleared. With time there could be more research and information gathered to help improve future actions, as there are 9 other pipes in the Tonka project area that have a *higher score** than the best of the 3 pipes that would be removed under through road storage actions covered in the PRD ATM (*based on FS ranking criteria and aggregate scores of those criteria).
- H. Medalen: Mentioned how at the last meeting the origin of red pipes was discussed and how an engineer chose these pipes. Now after time they aren’t up to standards. Is it an internal agency direction that changed the standards? J. Anderson: It’s a combined effort between ADF&G, Forest Service and others that constitute what is a red pipe and what is not. It’s an ongoing topic.
- H. Medalen: So it hasn’t been quantified on what damage has been done to fisheries? J. Anderson: There has been some discussion on this. The handout “How Red Pipes are Prioritized for Replacement” explains the criteria a bit more.
- J. Anderson gave a breakdown of the four criteria used for red pipe replacement scoring as written in the handout:
 - Meters of Upstream Habitat (length of upstream habitat in meters)
 - Stream Gradient
 - Pools per Meter
 - Barrierity
- J. Anderson explained how these four criteria are looked at to prioritize pipes and that priority is considered when limited dollars are available.
- B. Paust: This involved upstream migration of spawning adults but doesn’t include juveniles going downstream? This is an issue.

- J. Anderson: Red pipe designation is based on the ability of a stream crossing to accommodate all life stages of fish. Adults and juveniles, moving upstream and downstream.
- A major concern was voiced about how if nothing is put into the stewardship contract in the Tonka sale, our budgets will be cut and the money will go to something else. C. Anderson: These funds are a separate account. There is not a debit card to spend this money nor is there direct access. Under stewardship authority 50% of the money has to come back here and be spent here. The other half is the Regional Forester's discretion.
- It was then asked to clarify that since 50% of the funds come back here, we could just say "OK let's fix these pipes? And we could do it?" C. Anderson: We could add whatever we want on the list to be done. The collaborative effort helps define what actions on the list are a higher priority.
- L. Cabrera: Is there anyone who thinks we have to have something in the Tonka contract versus us trusting to put something in the proposal hoping that the 50% from the retained receipts will cover it? C. Anderson: The collaboration is all about trying to figure out what is important to everyone. J. Anderson: I do not believe it is possible to meet the requirements to add more into the stewardship contracts.
- H. Medalen: Gave a history on the 1960s and 1970s fish runs being low and low deer populations. Logging was accused for the downfall and nowadays there are more deer than there were then. He'd like to see more concentration on deer habitat restoration.
- It was asked if there were any salmon streams on Tonka that the FS knew of that were negatively affected? J. Anderson: Yes, for sure the streams on the 2 roads we are closing through the ATM.
- There was discussion about streams on Mitkof (per a request from Becky Knight regarding a red pipe replacement contract on Mitkof Island). The bid price information from that project can't be found. T. Parker: Looked On Fedbizops and it does show Bob Olson as the bidder on the Mitkof red pipe project, but no other information is on there. J. Anderson: We do have information from POW that we can look at for more information on costs of replacing red pipes.
- How much do they cost? T. Parker: On average, \$80,000 per pipe on POW.
- T. Parker: On the flip side, a pipe is costing 63,000 and around 20,000 for surveying and then any additional costs.
- B. Knight: Stewardship authority will expire in 2013 and has to be re-upped by congress? J. Anderson: Correct, and it's unknown what will happen with this authority in the future.
- J. Anderson: Frenchy was an old-growth stewardship contract with a red pipe included, which was estimated at \$16,000 for installation.
- B. Knight: That's a lot less, why? J. Anderson: This one is just installation so it's half the work. T. Parker: If we pull out a 48 pipes rarely ever will 48 go back in...it will probably be a bigger pipe.
- J. Anderson went back to the handout that gives examples from Thorne Bay and how they went about stewardship planning. It was reiterated that there isn't enough time to add new actions before the Tonka Stewardship Contract needs to be solicited. It would be effective to look into what can be done with the money that would come back.
- Where did the money come from for the work that's been done previously in POW (Staney)? J. Anderson: the Nature Conservancy provided funding support for the collaborative effort, along with the FS. He has tried to track the cost of collaboration but it's not an overt expense tracked by agency accounting systems. Jay estimated \$100,000 in personnel costs over a 2 year period to participate in the Staney collaborative process.
- B. Paust: We as a group should invite third parties in because there could be a lot more money that could be used. J. Anderson: Yes, and there is a lot of interest in these topics, which have

been supported by large organizations. B. Paust: Would J. Anderson have to give them a formal invitation? J. Anderson: No, anyone can invite other people or organizations. This is a public forum and so anyone can extend invitations. J. Anderson is a point of contact.

- J. Anderson: Would like to move forward to the things we have time to address and work on. The overall goal: How Petersburg would like to see the economic outputs of Tonka and more in the future.
- L. Cabrera: With the Best Value Criteria, it goes into the proposal and then into the Tonka contract? Then do we have to use the same one for the stewardship? J. Anderson: No we don't. We can see what everyone sees as most effective for local benefit. And it doesn't have to be the same for future stewardships. Mike Bell: It is important to remember not to cripple out operators. They should be able to focus on the task at hand. J. Anderson agreed and said it will take a lot of collaboration.
- D. Randrup: Explained about a 1994 synthesis study that was done. There were a lot of recommendations such as not to cut low altitude high volume old-growth and then it raised a lot of issues. There were some recommendations stated along with questions and to this day many have not been answered. He is interested in seeing some work done to answer these questions, getting more information, and possibly see some answers through stewardship? He would also like to see more emphasis on improving deer habitat.
- J. Anderson responded with the fact that yes there are a lot of unknowns. It would be good to look into new research. Thinning is important and habitat conditions are a concern. There are other experts such as Paul Alaback and Dave Persons from the State who could come here and discuss it further and give more insight to these topics. However, it is nearly impossible to answer all the questions and find out exactly how many deer there are. Yes, we should concentrate on habitat. We know we are losing habitat and so how do we manage that and generate more. J. Anderson thinks we should spend more time on this topic in future meetings as well.
- It was requested the FS bring more information on a study being done on clearcuts by 8-10 people. J. Anderson said he knew of a lot of studies being done and will look into it for next time.
- B. Paust: Would these presentations in the future be accessible on a website? There needs to be more publishing of this stuff for the public to have access. J. Anderson: Yes, very much agreed. He is even hoping to have a link on KFSK's website as well.
- J. Anderson asked Ted Sandhofer to explain more about the Best Value Criteria and those he used for Frenchy.
- T. Sandhofer: Price is an influential Best Value Criteria in contracting. However, we can weigh in other factors as well that we feel are important. In some cases 50% of the criteria is about price and the other half is the technical approach. Then there are other factors such as local hire and so on. It's all about finding out what is more important to the group.
- T. Parker asked if it can be put in the contract to maintain 5 workers from Petersburg in the workforce. T. Sandhofer: If those 5 guys aren't performing, they move, or something similar, it's hard to fault the contractor because he did make an effort. There is also a way to put in the contract that local hire isn't just Petersburg, but all of Southeast Alaska. It's been used in the past but that can also be changed.
- S. Cangialosi: As part of the contract, can we ask that they deliver some raw logs to Petersburg for non-profit use? T. Sandhofer: We can pay them to do that but cannot require them to do that unless it was appraised. J. Anderson added that if that was a requirement, the contractors would have to count that into their bid and it would essentially change things.

- S. Cangialosi: Well this would be a way that smaller operations could get a piece of the action and create more local business. J. Anderson: It would be like the example of “separating the log from the logger” there are cases of this but he doesn’t feel we have enough social license to do it up here.
- T. Sanhofer added that the FS doesn’t broker the logs, they do timber sales.
- S. Cangialosi: What happens to the non-merchantable material? T. Sandhofer: The operator leaves it. There are standards that they have to look into and meet regarding slash. Sometimes they have to take it but otherwise it stays there. J. Anderson added that there is no market for non-merchantable (pulp log) material in Alaska
- H. Medalen: The problem is that loggers are in the business to sell logs and if someone wanted to buy a log they would probably come up with a price for it but then there’s the issue of dragging it through the Narrows and then there’s no LTF up to standards on this side.
- J. Anderson: Moving back towards the discussion about the criteria, it seems that the group has a general consensus about everyone taking the information home and looking it over further and contributing feedback at a later time.
- L. Cabrera: Can we see a draft of the proposal? T. Sandhofer: Yes, it’ll be ready by mid-August, most likely. The public has the ability to weigh in and there is flexibility. He still believes the bids are going to be fairly close J. Anderson: Come mid-August we could meet again and show participants the draft for best value criteria and then after the feedback they can go back in and change, if necessary.
- Follow ups:
 - J. Anderson looked into other options for other third parties to facilitate meetings and keep things moving and keep meetings productive (it is difficult to be an active participant and a facilitator).
 - J. Anderson also found more information on FACA and there are copies of a handout available, however the effort seems to be working well.
 - Red Pipe follow up: Prioritized as far as red pipes. There are questions about how effective, habitat quality, and enhancements. J. Anderson has offered to bring in experts in different fields so we can learn as a group. This will help provide better feedback. P. Anderson can do video screen but can be here in person probably in August. Other possibilities include a forest silviculturist, ADF&G, and more. The group decided that these options would be highly useful.
- H. Medalen would like to see a slide show of pictures of red pipes, new ones, old ones, and so on so that the group can get a better visual. Possibly an example of an enhancement vs. red pipe. J. Anderson agreed to get something together and have someone bring one in. Possibly John McDonell?
- J. Anderson also wanted to make sure there is no major topics being left out that someone might want to address. M. Bell pointed out that road closures is something else of interest.
- H. Medalen: Is it a done deal to close the roads on Tonka with the 3 NEPA approved red pipes for removal? J. Anderson: There isn’t enough money to close all the roads identified but the budget for maintaining these roads has gone down a great deal so it’s not for sure, but it would look into reversing or possibly trading out a different road to be closed instead.
- M. Bell would like to address the dock at Tonka. P. Anderson: Yes the dock has come up in the RAC meetings J. Anderson: Larry Dunham also may have come up with a plan.

- M. Bell stated the fact that it's very important to have a safe place to tie up over there. J. Anderson agreed that if there is going to be continued work over there it does need to be addressed.
- D. Koenigs: Upland parking at Tonka, it appears a lot of the abandoned vehicles were disposed of, however, is there a way to place a policy for proper maintenance and licensing over there so that the areas stay cleaned up?
- D. Koenigs: Earlier enhancement was mentioned. Is there a way to make a list of other streams that could benefit from the enhancement approach rather than just the ones with red pipes? Even though there are 3 identified, he is curious if there is a better option. Could we as a group look into alternatives? Just to look for the best benefits and then add that in at a later time? In addition D. Koenigs mentioned that having a contractor over there creates opportunity for better management as well.
- C. Anderson: One of the benefits from this collaboration effort is to get a broad scope of options. There is matching money for everything on this list to stretch the stewardship dollars further. There are lots of grant opportunities and anyone in the group can apply for grants to get more of these projects done.
- P. Anderson: Totally agree lots about these trails and Leo Luzack could look into it...lots of these roads need extensive clean up because of these roads getting things like fridges being dumped and so on. Also addressing tree thinning let's talk about fuel reduction to get more funding like in the lower 48...just to see if we get more money.
- D. Randrup encourages the group to try and bring more youth into these meetings seeing as though this will be affecting them and their future. P. Anderson agreed and thought we should set aside times during meetings for the youth to talk about their concerns.
- P. Anderson: So as far as next meeting? J. Anderson: He needs more time in between meetings to gather information for the group. Possibly a later date in June? The group agreed to wait on an email about when the next meeting will be.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.